UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,035	06/04/2004	Arvind Prabhakar	03226/493002; SUN040039	4145

32615 7590 08/13/2008	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN	MAI, KEVIN S	
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800		
HOUSTON, TX 77010	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2152	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com
DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM
hathaway@oshaliang.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 July 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>31-48</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>31-48</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed July 7,

2008.

2.   Claims 1-30 have been canceled. Claims 31-48 have been added. Claims 31-48 have

been examined and are pending.

Specification

3.   The objection to the specification has been withdrawn in view of the amendments made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5.   Claims 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention. Claims 43-48 recite 'computer readable medium comprising executable instructions';

however computer readable medium was never disclosed in the specification. As such these

amendments appear to be adding new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

7.   Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 31-36 appear to only be claiming software and as such

are seen to be claiming non statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9.   Claims 31-33, 36-39, 42-45 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by US Pat. No. 5892919 to Nielsen (hereinafter "Nielsen").

10.   **As to Claim 31,** Nielsen discloses **a system for translating domain names comprising:**

a Uniform Resource Locater (URL) detection module, configured to:

receive a URL request by a user to access a destination fully qualified domain name

(FQDN) (Figure 4 of Nielsen discloses a user issuing a GET command for a network address

such as a URL (400), then figure 5 discloses looking up the issued URL in the spell check cache

(500). As such it is seen that because the invention looks up the issued URL in its spell check

cache, that it must have received the issued URL**), and**

determine that the URL request is an invalid URL request (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses

checking to see if the issued URL is found in the spell check cache. If it is not found the GET

command is issued with the URL as is, however if it is found in the spell check cache it is

determined that the current URL is invalid and must be processed (500,505))**;**

a URL redirection module, configured to:

receive the invalid URL request from the URL detection module (Figure 5 of Nielsen

discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL

(515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping

module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have

redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module. As such it is further seen that that

component must have received the invalid URL request as well**), and**

redirect the invalid URL request to a FQDN translation module (Figure 5 of Nielsen

discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL

(515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping

module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have

redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module**); and**

the FQDN translation module, configured to:

translate the invalid URL request to a target valid FQDN using a FQDN mapping module

(Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and

then issuing that URL instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid

URL has been translated to the correct URL).

11.   **As to Claim 32,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31,

further comprising:

a FQDN default setter configured to provide a default target valid FQDN, wherein the

FQDN default setter is used by the FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses if

the invention is unable to conclusively correct the invalid URL it will return a page to the user

with the candidate URL and a request for other candidates. This is seen to be a default target

valid FQDN, as it is the default if the correction to the invalid URL is not readily available).

12.   **As to Claim 33,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31,

wherein the FQDN mapping module is configured to provide a mapping between the

invalid URL request and the target valid FQDN (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that

holds the invalid URLs and the correct URLs that they have been mapped to and then figure 5

discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL (545). This is seen to be

having provided a mapping between the invalid URL and target valid FQDN).

13.   **As to Claim 36,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31,

wherein the URL detection module, the URL redirection module, and the FQDN

translation module execute in a browser (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's

computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software. Then column

2 lines 55-60 disclose the spell checking will transparently correct the URL and instruct the browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Since the spell checker is able to instruct the browser it is seen to be executing inside the browser. As such it is seen that all associated modules are executing within the browser).

14.   **As to Claim 37,** Nielsen discloses **a method for translating domain names, comprising:**

receiving, by a Uniform Resource Locater (URL) detection module, a URL request from a user to access a destination fully qualified domain name (FQDN) (Figure 4 of Nielsen discloses a user issuing a GET command for a network address such as a URL (400), then figure 5 discloses looking up the issued URL in the spell check cache (500). As such it is seen that because the invention looks up the issued URL in its spell check cache, that it must have received the issued URL)**, and**

determining, by the URL detection module that the URL request is an invalid URL request (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses checking to see if the issued URL is found in the spell check cache. If it is not found the GET command is issued with the URL as is, however if it is found in the spell check cache it is determined that the current URL is invalid and must be processed (500,505))**;**

receiving, by a URL redirection module, the invalid URL request from the URL detection module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another

component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module. As such it is further

seen that that component must have received the invalid URL request as well)**;**

redirecting, by the URL redirection module, the invalid URL request to a FQDN

translation module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can

find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping

module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen

that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module)**;**

translating, by the FQDN translation module, the invalid URL request to a target valid

FQDN using a FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct

URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL instead of the original URL

(545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL)**; and**

directing the user to a web site associated with the target valid FQDN (Figure 5 of Nielsen

discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL

instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated

to the correct URL, which was then issued)**.**

15.   **As to Claim 38,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37**,**

further comprising:

providing a default target valid FQDN by a FQDN default setter, wherein the FQDN

default setter is used by the FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses if the

invention is unable to conclusively correct the invalid URL it will return a page to the user with

the candidate URL and a request for other candidates. This is seen to be a default target valid

FQDN, as it is the default if the correction to the invalid URL is not readily available).

16.   **As to Claim 39,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37,

wherein the FQDN mapping module is configured to provide a mapping between the

invalid URL request and the target valid FQDN (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that

holds the invalid URLs and the correct URLs that they have been mapped to and then figure 5

discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL (545). This is seen to be

having provided a mapping between the invalid URL and target valid FQDN).

17.   **As to Claim 42,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37,

wherein the URL detection module, the URL redirection module, and the FQDN

translation module execute in a browser (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's

computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software. Then column

2 lines 55-60 disclose the spell checking will transparently correct the URL and instruct the

browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Since the spell checker is able

to instruct the browser it is seen to be executing inside the browser. As such it is seen that all

associated modules are executing within the browser).

18.   **As to Claim 43,** Nielsen discloses **a computer readable medium comprising**

executable instructions for translating domain names by:

receiving, by a Uniform Resource Locater (URL) detection module, a URL request from a user to access a destination fully qualified domain name (FQDN) (Figure 4 of Nielsen discloses a user issuing a GET command for a network address such as a URL (400), then figure 5 discloses looking up the issued URL in the spell check cache (500). As such it is seen that because the invention looks up the issued URL in its spell check cache, that it must have received the issued URL)**, and**

determining, by the URL detection module that the URL request is an invalid URL request (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses checking to see if the issued URL is found in the spell check cache. If it is not found the GET command is issued with the URL as is, however if it is found in the spell check cache it is determined that the current URL is invalid and must be processed (500,505))**;**

receiving, by a URL redirection module, the invalid URL request from the URL detection module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module. As such it is further seen that that component must have received the invalid URL request as well**;**

redirecting, by the URL redirection module, the invalid URL request to a FQDN translation module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses processing the requested URL to see if it can find the associated correct URL (515,520). This is seen to be part of the FQDN mapping module. Since the FQDN mapping module receives the requested URL for processing it is seen that another component must have redirected the URL to the FQDN mapping module)**;**

translating, by the FQDN translation module, the invalid URL request to a target valid

FQDN using a FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses returning the correct

URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL instead of the original URL

(545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated to the correct URL)**; and**

directing the user to a web site associated with the target valid FQDN (Figure 5 of Nielsen

discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL and then issuing that URL

instead of the original URL (545, 550). Thus it is seen that the invalid URL has been translated

to the correct URL, which was then issued**).**

19.   **As to Claim 44,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43**,**

further comprising:

providing a default target valid FQDN by a FQDN default setter, wherein the FQDN

default setter is used by the FQDN mapping module (Figure 5 of Nielsen discloses if the

invention is unable to conclusively correct the invalid URL it will return a page to the user with

the candidate URL and a request for other candidates. This is seen to be a default target valid

FQDN, as it is the default if the correction to the invalid URL is not readily available)**.**

20.   **As to Claim 45,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43**,**

wherein the FQDN mapping module is configured to provide a mapping between the

invalid URL request and the target valid FQDN (Figure 3 of Nielsen discloses a table that

holds the invalid URLs and the correct URLs that they have been mapped to and then figure 5

discloses returning the correct URL from the originally invalid URL (545). This is seen to be

having provided a mapping between the invalid URL and target valid FQDN).

21.   **As to Claim 48,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43,

wherein the URL detection module, the URL redirection module, and the FQDN

translation module execute in a browser (Column 5 lines 20-25 of Nielsen disclose the user's

computing device running a network browser such as a WWW browser software. Then column

2 lines 55-60 disclose the spell checking will transparently correct the URL and instruct the

browser to return the document addressed by the corrected URL. Since the spell checker is able

to instruct the browser it is seen to be executing inside the browser. As such it is seen that all

associated modules are executing within the browser).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

23.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

24.   Claims 34, 35, 40, 41, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nielsen and further in view of US Pat. 6151624 to Teare et al. (hereinafter

"Teare").

25.   **As to Claim 34,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 31.

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein the URL request comprises an alias, wherein the**

alias is stored in the FQDN mapping module.

        However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in

a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table

(606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs)

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

combine the system of claim 1 as disclosed by Nielsen, with having the URL request comprise

an alias and having the alias be stored in the mapping module disclosed by Teare. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine because it is desirable to have a

way to access information available over the Web using a natural language word or "real" name

associated with the information (column 4 lines 4-6 of Teare).

26.   **As to Claim 35,** Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim

34**, wherein the FQDN mapping module comprises a mapping of the alias to the target**

valid FQDN (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network

address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override

table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs**).**

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

27.   **As to Claim 40,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 37.

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein the URL request comprises an alias, wherein the**

alias is stored in the FQDN mapping module.

However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in

a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table

(606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs)

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

28.   **As to Claim 41,** Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim

40, **wherein the FQDN mapping module comprises a mapping of the alias to the target**

valid FQDN (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's network

address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The override

table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs**).**

Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

29.   **As to Claim 46,** Nielsen discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim 43.

Nielsen does not explicitly disclose **wherein the URL request comprises an alias, wherein the**

alias is stored in the FQDN mapping module.

        However, Teare discloses this (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in

a browser's network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table

(606). The override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs)

        Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

30.   **As to Claim 47,** Nielsen-Teare discloses the invention as claimed as described in claim

46**, wherein the FQDN mapping module comprises a mapping of the alias URL request to**

the target valid FQDN (Figure 6 of Teare discloses receiving a real name entry in a browser's

network address field (602) and then looking up the real name in an override table (606). The

override table is shown in figure 10 to map addresses to specific URLs**).**

        Examiner recites the same rationale to combine used in claim 34.

Conclusion

31.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KEVIN S. MAI whose telephone number is (571)270-5001. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KSM

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152